



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,069	09/15/2000	Anandakumar Varatharajah	A-69227/MAK/LM	3198
30636	7590	08/16/2005	EXAMINER	
FAY KAPLUN & MARCIN, LLP 150 BROADWAY, SUITE 702 NEW YORK, NY 10038			GARG, YOGESH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/663,069	VARATHARAJAH, ANANDAKUMAR
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yogesh C. Garg	3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-10 and 12-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-10 and 12-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment received on 6/13/2005 is acknowledged and entered. The applicant has amended claims 1, 9, 12 and canceled claim 11. Currently amended claims 1-10 and 12-19 remain pending for examination.

***Response to Arguments***

2.1. In view of the amendment made to independent claim 1 and the arguments filed on 6/13/2005 with regards to the term, " data farm" (see Remarks, page 5, paragraph 3), that data farm as disclosed in specification, see page 5, lines 23-26 provides an electronic-receipts repository for receiving and storing transaction records, the arguments are persuasive and the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8, 14-15 under 35 USC 101 is withdrawn.

2.2. In view of the arguments filed on 6/13/2005 with regards to claim 18, see remarks, page 5, the arguments are persuasive and the rejection of claim 18 under 35 USC 101 is withdrawn.

2.3. Applicant's arguments, that " data farm may act as an electronic receipts repository for receiving and storing transaction records", filed on 6/13/2005 concerning rejection of claims 16-17 under 35 USC 101 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The specification, see page 5, lines 23-26 does not define or describe " data farm" as a computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defining structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. Data merely stored in a computer readable medium to be read or outputted by a computer without any functional interrelationship, and thus do not impart functionality to the computer, i.e., they are not computer components. Examples of Non-Functional Descriptive Material: Music, Literature, Art, Photographs, Data base per se

are directed to neither a "process" nor a "machine," but rather embraces or overlaps two different statutory classes of invention set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101 which is drafted so as to set forth the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only. Id. at 1551. Therefore, rejection of claims 16-17 under 35 USC 101 is maintained.

2.4. In view of the arguments filed on 6/13/2005 with regards to claim 13, see remarks, page 6, the arguments are persuasive and the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is withdrawn.

2.5. Applicant's arguments, that "Claim 12 has been amended to provide antecedent basis for the limitations contained therein", filed on 6/13/2005 concerning rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Amended claim 12 recites the limitation, " retrieving the electronic receipt" but neither of the claims 9 or 10, the parent claims of claim 12 teach or disclose storing electronic receipts in a memory or database from where they need to be retrieved. As recited claims 9 and 10 are directed to generating electronic receipts and are silent if the electronic receipt is recorded/stored in any medium. If the electronic receipt is not stored then it is unclear as how it can be retrieved and from where. Therefore, rejection of claim 12under 35 USC 112, second paragraph is maintained.

2.6. Applicant's argues (see Remarks, pages 6-8), that the reference Kraemer does not anticipate currently amended claims 1 and therefore its dependencies 2, 5, 7, 8 and 14-15, **because Kraemer does not teach generating electronic receipts only as a result of the purchase; as such web-pages generated from merchant sites in response to the user's selection of products should not be considered electronic receipts and therefore selection of line items from the web-pages does not correspond to selection of first line item from first electronic receipt and thereby forming an electronic list . The examiner respectfully disagrees. In response**

to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **Kraemer does not teach generating electronic receipts only as a result of the purchase**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Since claim 1 does not provide any relationship of generating electronic receipts as a result of the previous purchase transaction only the examiner, as per the MPEP guidelines, applies the broadest reasonable meaning of the term, " electronic receipt", that is any data received electronically. In Kraemer, as submitted in the previous office action the merchants web-pages are electronic receipts as a result of the user's selection of products and from the merchant's web-page, that is electronic receipt, the user selects line items forming a list of product (s) associated with the user (see at least col.5, line 25-col.6, line 63).

In view of the foregoing, the applicant's arguments against rejection of claims 16-19 are not persuasive also for the same reasons as analyzed above.

2.7. Applicant's arguments with respect to currently amended claims 9-10 and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated due to amendments to these claims.

2.8. The applicant has not traversed the examiner's reasoning for using Official notice in rejecting claim 6 (The applicant's arguments, regarding claim 6, see page 9 are directed against the primary reference Kraemer and the Official Notice). Therefore, examiner's Official Notice is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate. See MPEP 2144.04 C: " To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include

stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also *Chevenard*, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 ("[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention."). ... If applicant adequately traverses the examiner's assertion of official notice, the examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office action if the rejection is to be maintained. See 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). See also *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1386, 59 USPQ2d at 1697 ("[T]he Board [or examiner] must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings" to satisfy the substantial evidence test). ... If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate.... ".

This is a Final rejection

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed inventions are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 16-17 are directed to disembodied data structure claim which are per se not statutory. C.f. *In re Wamerdam*. Terms, such as e-merchant, data farm do not define or

describe a computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defining structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. **A claim to a computer readable medium encoded with functional descriptive material that can function with a computer to effect a practical application that results in a useful, concrete an tangible result (i.e. running an assembly line or executing a stock transaction) satisfies Section 101.** See U.S. Patent 5,710,578 to Beauregard etc. i.e., **a set of instructions in combination with a computer system.** C.f. In re Wamerdam - data structure stored in a computer memory, and In re Lowery, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994) - data structure in a computer readable medium. Examples of Statutory Functional Descriptive Material are:

(a) A claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a functional data structure – this defines structural and functional relationships between the data structure and the hardware/software components. See Wamerdam.

(b) A claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program - this defines structural and functional relationships between the computer program and the computer itself which allows the program's functionality to be realized provided that a useful, concrete and tangible result is realized. See U.S. Patent 5,710,578 to Beauregard et al.

Data merely stored in a computer readable medium to be read or outputted by a computer without any functional interrelationship, and thus do not impart functionality to the computer, i.e., they are not computer components. Examples of Non-Functional Descriptive Material :Music, Literature, Art, Photographs, Data base per se are directed to neither a "process" nor a "machine," but rather embraces or overlaps two different statutory classes of invention set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101 which is drafted so as to set forth the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only. Id. at 1551.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted step is: creating an electronic record/storage of the electronic receipt. Amended claim 12 recites the limitation, " retrieving the electronic receipt" but neither of the claims 9 or 10, the parent claims of claim 12 teach or disclose storing electronic receipts in a memory or database from where they need to be retrieved. As recited claims 9 and 10 are directed to generating electronic receipts and are silent if the electronic receipt is recorded/stored in any medium. If the electronic receipt is not stored then it is unclear as how it can be retrieved and from where.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 8 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraemer (US Patent 6,490,602)

Regarding claims 1-2, 5, 7, 8, 14-15, Kraemer discloses a method for manipulating receipt data, the method comprising:

participating in a first transaction at a first merchant and participating in a second transaction at a second merchant, thereby generating first and second electronic receipts , selecting a first line item from a first electronic receipt and selecting a second line item from a first electronic receipt/second electronic receipt, thereby forming an electronic list including both the first and second line items and storing the list on a data farm; authorizing a group of people to review the list, reviewing the list, the reviewing performed by one of the group of people and placing a order for the first line item by one of a consumer and a shopping service (see col.5, line 25-col.6, line 63. Note: The electronic receipt corresponds to any stored transaction record [see applicant's specification page 5, lines 23-26] in data form which can be communicated via a network. Kraemer teaches allowing gift-recipients to participate with a plurality of web-pages belonging to different merchants, selecting first and second line items from the web-pages [web-pages selected by the gift-recipient correspond to the claimed electronic receipts as they are generated as a result of selection of products from different merchant sites, and the gift-recipient is capable of selecting one or more items from a web-page of one vendor and more items from another web-page of another vendor ] and then forming an electronic list of these products including both first and second line items [ col.6, lines 7-11,... "Adding the product to a list of

*products in the account associated with the user. Sufficient information about the retailer and product are gathered and stored in an account created for the gift-recipient to enable the product to be purchased at a later date* “. Note: Since the list is generated using computers it is an electronic list and is stored in a data base [ data farm-because it would be inherent to store the list in a data base to make it available for viewing it to others] and the group of purchasers, who want to buy gifts for the gift-recipient are authorized to review this list of products and place an order for the first line item by one of a consumer and a shopping service [ the purchaser corresponds to the consumer and the functionality server 100 corresponds to a shopping service as claimed]).

Regarding claims 16-17, their limitations are already covered in claims 1-2, 5, 7, 8, 14-15, and are therefore analyzed and rejected on the same basis. The first and second e-merchants correspond to web-pages of different vendors, a data farm correspond to the memory of the functionality server which stores the web-pages [the electronic receipts], and the functionality server 100 corresponds to a shopping service which perform the claimed limitations as already analyzed in claims 1-2, 5, 7, 8, 14-15 above.

Regarding claims 18-19, their limitations are already covered in claims 1-2, 5, 7, 8, 14-15, and are therefore analyzed and rejected on the same basis.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

61. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kraemer and in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 6, Kraemer discloses reviewing as already analyzed in claim 2 above.

Kraemer further discloses that reviewing comprises viewing (see at least col.6, lines 41-44, “.....*the gift-giver may be presented with a series of screens, the total of which displays the gift-recipient 's list of registered gifts...*” ) but does not disclose commenting on the list. The examiner takes Official Notice of the notoriously well-known fact that gift-givers after viewing the gift-registry do comment by expressing their opinion about the items they saw and their cost and availability for selection with their family members or common friends. In view of the Official Notice, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art to have modified Kraemer to modify to incorporate the notoriously well-known concept of comments by gift-givers after viewing the gift-registry because it helps the other family members and friends to make informed and better decisions in selecting the gifts for the gift-registrant.

6.2. Claims 9-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kraemer and in view of Moran et al. ( US Patent 6,185,542), hereinafter, referred to Moran.

Regarding claims 9-10 and 12, Kraemer teaches a method for purchasing goods, including services, from multiple merchants, the method comprising:

selecting first and second goods for purchase on respective first and second websites (it is already covered in claims 1-2, 5, 7-8 and 14-15 above); paying for the first and second goods through the second website with one transaction from a consumer perspective, wherein the step

of paying comprises automatically placing first and second orders for the first and second goods with the respective first and second websites (see at least col.7, lines 35-43, “ *The method of the present invention may be used to devise a multi-retailer shopping cart, whereby the user can accumulate multiple products from independent retailers within a single virtual shopping cart. The user may select a "Purchase all products" within the toolbox to submit their credit card and contact information to all the retailers, for all the products within their shopping cart, all at once. Purchasing multiple products from multiple retailers all at once significantly increases convenience for the user.* ”. Note: Since the user is allowed to purchase from a plurality of websites and if he is purchasing from two different websites then he would inherently close his purchase transaction at the second website and by selecting the button, “ Purchase all products” he checks out at the second website which inherently includes the payment as well for the products and the orders are placed on the first and second websites belonging to first and second vendors. ).

Kraemer also teaches creating an electronic record of the selected goods and retrieving an electronic record of the first and second orders (see at least col.5, line 25-col.6, line 63, which discloses, as analyzed above for claims 1-2, 5, 7-8 and 14-15 that items selected by the gift-recipient from a web-page of one vendor are added to the items listed from another web-page of another vendor to form a gift registry list and this registry list is retrieved by the purchaser to view the items. Note: Electronic record corresponds to the list for products, that is gift-registry formed by the gift-recipient). Kraemer does not disclose generating an electronic receipt for the transaction, the receipt including line item for each of the first and second goods and retrieving the electronic receipt. However, in the same field of endeavor, that is purchase

transactions, Moran teaches disclose generating an electronic receipt for the transaction, the receipt including line item for each of the first and second goods and retrieving the electronic receipt (see at least Abstract and col.2, lines 24-64, " *FIG. 1 illustrates a system for implementing the invention. Store 111 has store computer 104 that controls POS terminals 106-107. Attached to each POS terminal is a standard grocery code scanner, such as grocery code scanner 108. .... Store computer 104 can transmit email to personal computer (PC) 112 via Internet Providers 102 and 103 and Internet 101. One skilled in the art could readily see that store computer 104 could directly transmit over the public telephone network email messages to a computer on which PC 112 had an email account without the utilization of Internet 101... During the purchasing of goods, store computer 104 has access to all items, prices, and bar codes that are being purchased at a POS terminal. The customer is identified to store computer 104 by a store club card given to the customer by the store. .... In operation, the customer had previously submitted to the store the email address of PC 112. After a transaction is complete, store computer 104 transmits an email message to PC 112. This email message is stored on Internet Provider 103 which is the Internet Provider for PC 112. The transaction data can then be retrieved at some later point in time by PC 112 either under manual control of the customer or PC 112 can be set up to automatically check for email messages that contain transaction data. Once the transaction data is retrieved from Internet Provider 103, PC 112 utilizes the transaction data to update a spreadsheet or other program which reflects the customer budget and to update the grocery inventory if groceries were purchased from store 111. One skilled in the art could readily see that there could be a plurality of stores. ". Also see col.3, lines 24-36. Note: Moran teaches to generate an electronic copy of transaction data of the purchase transaction done, say at a grocery store, and transmits this electronic copy, which corresponds to an electronic receipt of the transaction data as it includes all the details of a transaction including each line items, price, description, etc. In view of Moran, it would have been obvious to one of an*

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have modified Kraemer to incorporate the feature of generating an electronic receipt of the purchase transactions done at both the web sites and record it because this will enable the user to retrieve the transaction data at a later point of time to update the inventory of the items purchased earlier or update the records pertaining to budget or for other reasons as are known to an ordinary skill in the art.

6.3. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kraemer in view of Moran and further in view of the article posted on Internet, "End-to-End Enterprise Solution: Extending the Reach of Retail Stores Through Point-of-Sale Web Technology" (December 1999 on website <http://java.sun.com/features/1999/12/atpos..html>).

Regarding claim 13, Kraemer further teaches viewing an advertisement (see at least col.3, line 53-col.4, line 7, "..... *Toolbar 150 provides enhanced functionality, such as services "Purchase this product" or "Register this product." Toolbar 150 may also provide other general functions such as "Home" and "Help". Toolbar 150 may also include a graphical presentation such as an **advertisement**. .... Toolbar 150 may also include sponsored presentations such as advertising banners.* ....") but does not disclose that this advertisement is displayed while paying. However, in the field of same endeavor, "End-to-End Enterprise Solution" discloses this feature ( see page 1, ".....*customers select their preferred payment method..... participate in surveys and be treated to targeted color display and banner ads...all the time it takes to process the customer's payment transaction...*"). In view of "End-to-End Enterprise Solution", it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have modified Kraemer in view of Moran as applied to claim 10 to incorporate the feature of displaying advertisement during the step of paying because the

advertisements fills up the payment processing time, which is utilized to display targeted advertisements based upon the customer's profile and which is expected to increase the revenues and profits of the manufacturers of items for which the advertisements are displayed.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

(i) US Patents 5,739, 512 to Tognazzini (see at least Abstract), 6,327,576 to Ogasawara (see at least Abstract), 6,533,168 to Ching (see at least Abstract), 6,543,683 to Hoffman (see at least Abstract), 6,738,749 to Chasko (see at least Abstract) disclose generating electronic receipts with line items purchased and storing the electronic receipts in data repositories for later date retrieving the receipts for different intended uses.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh C. Garg whose telephone number is 571-272-6756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on 571-272-7159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Yogesh C Garg  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3625

YCG  
August 9, 2005